

# WORKS

## FOR AN

### Excellent

Containing

An Examination of several *Miscellaneous*  
Texts of Scripture.

Prepared, *These Years* since, by *the*  
and Exercise of one, *more*  
than *deservedly* extended  
of Learning;) the *new*  
public.

The whole being submitted  
if necessary, of *the*

*For the sake of the*  
*same with the*  
*the same*

*the same*

# WORK

FOR

Excellent

Containing

An Examination of several Miscellaneous  
Texts of the

Scripture, some of which are  
and Exercise of one, more than  
than (especially) extended for  
of (reading) the way, in new  
public

The whole being limited to the  
it is the duty of the

For the sake of the  
your part for the  
studies by the  
less are

There is no need of

OWN

Printed, and are to be sold by A. Young  
New York

# W O R K FOR AN Excellent Scholar, &c.

**A** S much *Intelligence* as, of late Years especially, hath com from the Common-Wealth of Learning; som of the *strangest News* that I have heard from that Coast, a long While, is That of so *Mighty a Man at Books*, and so well skill'd in *Feats of Authors*, † that he was not afraid of offering to discourse a Learned Prelate (whose ability in Affairs of that Nature, is too well known, both at home and abroad, to be farther spoken of;) on any subject of this sort, wharsoever.

† Less than a *Goliath*, or son of *Anak*, in the field of Arts and Sciences, who could have taken him for, that

heard the *Excomium* of An Excellent Scholar given him, as many did, on *December 17th* — 99, about 6 of the Clock in the Evening, at — by one of *Higher Degree* in the Church, than many Learned Men ever thought, or will think themselves worthy of? or would, if they could or might, be advanced to.

For this was the *only Proof* brought to demonstrate his Excellency.

Which I take to be *none at all*; unless a *confident Assertion* must pass for a Demonstration.

Whether the Challenge was accepted, and the Field appointed, is more than I know.

If it was, the most forward to *begin a Fray*, sped worst, I doubt not; as it often happens among Duellers: the most hasty to fight being, many times, least skill'd in the Business, and miscarrying soonest.

But whatever the effect of that Meeting was, if they met; the *rarity* of Excellency being such, that many (the most, I believ,) who are good at many things, are *Excellent* at nothing; what Lover of Learning would lose the opportunity of gaining som farther knowledge than he hath, by an *Excellent Scholar*? especially one that hath rugg'd and toyl'd day and night to catch more fish than hitherto he could meet with, or take holde of.

A man that is Excellently skill'd may help such a poor, painful Laborer, to a better draught than ever he hath had Experience of, since he knew to cast a Net.

From this Excellent Scholar therefor I desire to learn the meaning of a *list Monosyllabical word*, consisting of no more than two Letters. About the



sense of which I have many times been troubl'd ; but can hitherto com to no resolution, besides that of rejecting *all other* opinions, except one.

† One may sooner meet with a Cuckow at Christmas, or a Wood-Cock at Midsummer, than light on such Tools, at his need, in any tolerable distance from the place.

searching out such as meditation hath brought to minde. Which whether they are good or bad, right or wrong, I am willing to be determin'd by any competent Judge ; much more by an *Excellent Artist*.

The word occurs in *Exod. 12. 9*. It is *NA*. Which our English Translators render *RAW* ; as the most, if not all other Interpreters and Commentators give and insist upon that sense only, besides *Oleaster*.

All but he are pleased with his *crude*, unsatisfactory sense of the word ; which I finde no less hard to be digested than *Raw* flesh it self, as this singl dissenting Interpreter also did : with whose *Stomach* it agreed no more than it pleased his *Palate*.

For the *Israelites*, to whom the Word was spoken, (which the Translations generally take to signify *RAW*;) were neither *Canibals*, nor *Tartars*, whose *Stomachs* would serve them to eat *Raw*, or but *Half-roasted* flesh, as the Arabic words *ل* Naa, & *ن* Ni, from whence no mean *Crisper*

think fittest to derive this, are known to signify,

† *Apud Polum ad loc.*

\* *Sermon 7th pag. 208.*  
upon the old Testament.

† *Dr. Beveridge de lingua Orientali praestantia, p. 29.* Quid hoc vocabulo *NA* indigitetur, *sic lingua Arabica cognosci nequit*—

*Arabicis autem hoc dubiam statim resolvitur; quibus* *ل* *significat Cruda fuit.*

*Quod etiam vocabulum in Arabica translatione retinetur. ibid.*

Farther than this, that *polite* and *profound* Author (Professor of the same Languages at *Amsterdam*;) whose indefatigable Studies may as easily as deservedly be admir'd ; but will hardly be imitated by *one of a thousand*.

Farther than this, I say, he went not, in his Translation of, and Annotations upon the *Pentateuch*. †

† *Nè comedatis ex ea* (come) *Semicolum* quidquam. Quod vertimus, inquit, ex *Arabismo*; in quò *NA* Naa exponitur, non modò *cruda* fuit, sed etiam *Semicolla* Carò. *Johan. Cler. ad Exod. 12. 9.*



In which however I no more agree with him, than in som other things. For all this while I see no proof brought, nor any *explicit Reason* given why we must travel as far as *Arabia*, to finde out the meaning of the term. The only thing to be pleaded and insisted on, is, That the sound of a word, in that Countrey signifying RAW, agrees with the sound and Letters of this *Hebrew* monosyllable.

Which if it were an Argument of any force, why should not our English word *Piper* signify Pepper, as in Latin it doth? It is written with the same Letters, and pronounced in the same Manner.

It seems therefor that *Oleaster* went better to work, in deriving an *Ebren* word from another of the same language, than others who go farther off for what is neerer at hand to be had: that is, in fetching *Na* from *Na* *No*; which in *Hipbil* signifies to *break, divide, diffise, quarter, or cut asunder*. According to which Etymology, the sense of *NA* must be, *Divided, or cut into pieces, joynts, halves, or quarters*, as at other times, when a Lamb was dress'd and eaten for common food, their Manner was to do.

For if they had used to dress, roast and eat an intire, or whole Lamb, (as when the Paschal Feast was kept they were order'd to do ;) what need of forbidding them to quarter or divide it in any Manner had there been ?

To justify this which I take to be the truer sense of the place, (for more reasons than one; not far from hence to be set forth;) and is much more profitable to be moraliz'd, or applied to spiritual purposes; it seems needful to compare the derivation of NA from NO, with divers other, of like Nature and Descent, in the Hebrew tongue. Of which four there several set down in the margin \* of this leaf; to which more may as easily be added, as these <sup>but</sup> \* Sin פִּנְאָרְס, anguere obvious to be observed, without need of <sup>but</sup> Sin, ab פִּנְאָרְסַיִט פִּנְאָרְסַיִט more than ordinary attention to take notice <sup>but</sup> Chald. ab פִּנְאָרְסַיִט signat. M2 of them.

venire. 77 abscindere; avulsum, à 777 abscindere. 77 peregrinus, à 777 peregrinari, 77, & 77 Chald. zai, generatio, à 777, habitare; q. d. homines in eadem zai, vel generatione viventes. Buxt. Similiter 77 Judex, à 777 judicare 77 pauper, à 777 condere. 77 piscis, à 777 piscari. 77 alimentum à 777 pascere. 77 infidus, q. d. Avertens se ab aliquo, à 777 recedere, declinare. 77, turba mixta, Ps. 40. 9. à 777 ungere, misce-  
re, ut unguenta misceri solent. 77, vagus, Gen. 4. 12. à 777, errare, vagari. 77, vigil, à 777 expargisci. 77, Arcturus; & 777 item Stellam plurimam, & Ces-  
turus, à 777, coire. 77, abscondo, à 777, latere. 77, denovo, à 777, illudere. 77, cursor, à 777, currere. 77, sylva, ager incultus, à 777, incol-  
tus, (metaphorice, stupide, rudis, bardus, brutus.) & hebraico more, duplicato  
vocabulo, ad emphasin, valde rudis & incultus; unde Buxtorf, & Barbarus.  
Quæ omnia, cum multis aliis, per aliam secundam Radicem, Vau, formantur.

On this foundation if Olear's opinion was not built, I know not what other ground he laid it on.

However it was, this sense of eating the Paschal Lamb, Not divided jointed, quarter'd, or cut into pieces, but whole; for several reasons seems fittest.

1. This best agrees with the Scripture-way of adding Affirmatives to Negatives, and Negatives to Affirmatives, to illustrate each other the better. (As, *I shall not dy, but live* — Psalm, 118. 17. *God is light, and in him is no Darkness at all.* 1. John 1. 5. so John 1. 3. with many the like speeches.)

For two things being here forbidden, and two commanded; it is reasonable to judge that the two precepts (with which the whole Sentence is concluded,) are of set purpose made contrary to the two prohibitions which the speech begins with.

What are the 2 precepts or things commanded? One is contained in these words, [*Roast with fire;*] as contrary, we see, to the prohibition immediately preceding, [*Nor sodden (i. e. seethed, or boyled) at all with water,*] as fire and water are so each other. The other precept, or thing commanded, we have in the last words of the whole period: [*The head with the legs, and with the pertenance thereof.*] What is contrary to this? Not the Rawness, or but half-rawness of the Lamb, (which whether raw or roasted might still be whole; but the quartering, dividing or cutting it into pieces. This, and not to be eaten undress'd, or but half-dress'd, is that which carries opposition to what was first said, but by the figure Epanados (which the Scripture is no stranger to,) expounded last.

2. This interpretation best accords to that very Material and Significant Exposition of dressing and eating it in fire, (*The head with the legs, &c.*) which is given in the following part of the Chapter, at the 46th v. where *A bone of this typical Lamb is forbidden to be broken.*

So careful the Lord was to keep it from being cut into quarters, or other pieces. And why, or wherefore, but to teach us that we must not be guilty of dividing Christ (1 Cor. 1. 13.) whom the Lamb looked at, (and was an Image of) as the manner of too many in time past was, and of others (whose number is and ever was greater than good) still is; by causing Divisions and Offences, contrary to his Doctrine, Rom. 16.

Let them look to it, who are guilty of doing it.

Schismatics (truly so called) are they that give just occasion of Separation; not they that make it, but would gladly avoid it, if they could; having no private Reasons, or Self-ends of separating themselves, in opposition to that happy Concord and Union, which ought to be found among Christian People, and should there especially, if any where, be met with; but hath been for so lamentably-long a while banished out of Christendom it self, that no hope can be smaller than that of seeing it return. May the Author of Peace, and Lover of Concord (who best knows how to do it) devise Means to prevent his banished from being expell'd (for ever) from Him and



and U; according to that wise Woman's Speech, 2 Sam. 14. 14. But unless we expect and banish Ambition, Avarice, Self-Love, Pride and Self-conceit, with a long *Etcetera* of dividing Principles, and troublesome Inmates, which will not suffer Amity, Peace, Unity and Union, to come back to us and dwell among us: Why should we, or how can we hope to see them restored by *who can tel what Miracle?* While known Duties (no less possible than needful to be done) are neglected, must *no body knows what wonders* be wrought, to make us a People *so perfectly joined together in the same minde, and in the same judgement* (1 Cor. 1. 10.) that Christ may no more be divided by, or among such as affect to be called his People, than the Paschal Lamb (which in this and many other things was his Figure) could be lawfully and not sinfully *quarter'd, or cut in pieces?*

The Reader, I hope, will excuse this needfuller than long digression, which came so full in my way, that I could not tel how to turn aside from it. Now therefore to go on with what was before in hand.

3. What need had *Moses* to speak against their eating *Ram*, or *but half-roasted* Flesh; when it doth not appear, that they used to do it, or were then in danger of doing it; when his business was to tel them how the Lamb must be dress'd before it was eaten of?

If this *excellent Scholar* hath any thing better to offer for the fuller understanding of this Text (or any of the rest hereafter named) I will give him *more thanks* for such a favor, than for something else he hath had, or in reason could expect.

But in exercising his Talent of Preaching, (if it is not *hid too deep in the Earth* to be fetched up, or *too fast bound up in a Napkin*, to be open'd and imploy'd in his Master's Service:) I advise him as a Friend (not withstanding his having been an Enemy, a close, hidden, *underground* Enemy, that is generally most hateful, as well as hurtful, to one that never gave him Cause of being so ill-affected, by doing or saying any thing to, or of him, inconsistent with *Civility*, or *Christianity*. I advise him, I say, as a Friend, who hath been such an Enemy) by this and other mistakes, which the best Interpreters have now and then shew'd themselves subject to, to beware of trusting to a *Greek, Latin, English*, or other Translation of the Bible, without consulting the *very Words* of the Divine Oracles, for fear of saying nothing sometimes, to the purpose, when he thinks he hath spoken full home to the business.

For whoever is satisfied in seeing with another's Eyes only, will have *nothing but Clouds and Darkness* here and there to guide him; as they know by experience, who make it their business to be as sure as is possible, of what they say.

Some, saith an abler than ordinary Judge of these matters, being grown old in *unlearned Learning*, (so he calls a sort of skill, which may better be wanted than what none can do well without, in this way;)



† Dicere solent, satis sibi Translationem Hieronymi esse. *Sib. Munster*. in Epist. ad *Hm. S. Reg. Ang.*

and troubled Streams; or thought that the full force, *Emphasis*, and many times *Elegancy* of Scripture-words and Phrases could be expressed in the the Latin Tongue, or imitated and exhibited as exactly in another Language, as may render it as visible and apparent at second hand, as at first it ever was. Which none but Strangers to the Native Vigor and Property of the Tongues in which the Scriptures were spoken and written, will say, or can think. Were it possible for any Translation to be as Exact and

\* As that *Selir*, and *Seloh*, *Psal. 29. 30. 31. Mischpat* and *Mishpat*, *Tsedek* and *Tsedek*, *Esa. 5. 7. Phahad*, *Phahad*, *Phahad*, *Esa. 24. 17.* could be made to sound and signify in Latin, or any other Language, as in Hebrew they do.

been right, he would not have undertaken: But that his is neither to be rested in, or trusted to, as unquestionable, the Author before-prais'd, by

† Nam & divus Hieronymus ipse, praeferenda Biblia, & tamen praecipuum, *Epist. ad Hm. S. Reg. Ang.* in velle, et instrumentis suis habuit: non ullam Chaldaicam Translationem, aut Thargum; non Commentaria: sed nec Grammaticam hebraeam: sine quibus multa Scripturae loca recte excoli impossibile est, quicquid quidam dicant. *Munster. ubi su.*

Why then should an English Translation be confided in, when it cannot be maintained, or defended? Which Question is not put to disparage our *priviledg'd Bible*, appointed to be read in Churches, beyond others (none of the whole

¶ Which caused the same learned Man further to say, *Epist. ad Hm. S. Reg. Ang.* in velle, et instrumentis suis habuit: non ullam Chaldaicam Translationem, aut Thargum; non Commentaria: sed nec Grammaticam hebraeam: sine quibus multa Scripturae loca recte excoli impossibile est, quicquid quidam dicant. *Munster. ubi su.*

wont to say † That they need no more than *Hierom's Translation*, (to supply them with Scripture-Skil and Knowledge) as if they knew not the difference between clear Fountain-Water and troubled Streams; or thought that the full force, *Emphasis*, and many times *Elegancy* of Scripture-words and Phrases could be expressed in the the Latin Tongue, or imitated and exhibited as exactly in another Language, as may render it as visible and apparent at second hand, as at first it ever was. Which none but Strangers to the Native Vigor and Property of the Tongues in which the Scriptures were spoken and written, will say, or can think. Were it possible for any Translation to be as Exact and

Elegant, as Emphatical and Forceful as the Text it self; \* yet becaus there are many places ill rendred by Interpreters (as *Munster* could easily shew *Stretching Equivocal*, by more than 200 Examples, out of *Esaia* only;) How can he that knows not how to compare a Translation with the Text it self, be sure of what he saith? *Jerom* had reason enough, and too much to be unsatisfied with other Translations, before he began his own. Which, if others had been right, he would not have undertaken: But that his is neither to be rested in, or trusted to, as unquestionable, the Author before-prais'd, by sufficient Reasons hath shewed. † The general sense of which is, That he had not such Helps to render som Things better than they are, as others have since his time had. Which not withstanding, the best having sometimes been mistaken; they are not to be trusted without Tryal, or without Examination to he depended on.

¶ Which caused the same learned Man further to say, *Epist. ad Hm. S. Reg. Ang.* in velle, et instrumentis suis habuit: non ullam Chaldaicam Translationem, aut Thargum; non Commentaria: sed nec Grammaticam hebraeam: sine quibus multa Scripturae loca recte excoli impossibile est, quicquid quidam dicant. *Munster. ubi su.*

Nor

Nor let any that are Enemies to tru Religion, conclude from hence, That Holy Scripture is written so obscurely, that *Interpreters themselves* know not what to make of it; or think the Truth and Authority of it weakened, by being sometimes so *ill-handl'd*, that it is not the Word of God, but the weak and dark Imagination of Man's mind, which the best Translations exhibit to be read.

Let no such conclusion as this be made.

1. Because all those Escapes and Mistakes compared with the rest of the Bible, which all with one accord agree in; are but few: And it is not *reasonable*, that *many things* certain should be rejected for the sake of *any thing* doubtful.

2. Being generally but *light Errors*, of History, Number, Time, Place, or other Matters, in which *Faith and good Manners* are unconcern'd: The singular care of Divine Providence must here be confessed, that in things of this nature, there is so admirable a Concord between all Copies of Holy Scripture, however different Times, Places and Languages they were penn'd in; and so wonderful agreement between Interpreters about the sense of them; as sufficeth to stop the Mouths of all Atheists and *Anti-Scripturists* whatsoever.

Yet it ill becoms those who belong to the *Province* of teaching such holy and unquestionable Truths, to know them *at second hand only*; not being able for lack of *skil in the Word of Righteousness*, to compare *Spiritual things with Spiritual*, expressed in different Words and Phrases.

It is meet, that in *Poland, Transilvania*, and other foreign Places, not only Church-men and Gentlemen, but Trades-men and Artificers, should strive, som to be Artists, others to be *competently*, at least, if not *excellently* skill'd in Scripture-Languages, Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek; and spare no cost they are able to expend, to get both themselves and their Children instructed in such Knowledge: Yea that *Anabaptists* themselves, (those deadly Enemies of Human Learning, in time past) should do the like (for none of the best reasons, I fear;) while many of our own Communion, who are specially called to teach and maintain *sound Doctrin*, are for want of these Weapons, but ill-provided to defend it: especially in these disputing days, wherein the most clearly-revealed, and in better times unquestionable Truths, are *as fiercely as falsely* opposed with all manner of Arguments that can possibly be derived from wrested, abused, misunderstood, or mis-applied Scriptures.

What if a Learned *Romanist, Arian, Socinian*, or other skilful Adversary of Truth should assault us? With what Armor of proof would we save our selvs harmless? What offensive or defensive Weapons would we use to repel the Assailant?

There is *no Version* of the Bible owned on both sides. A Papist wil no more be tryed by *Luther's, Munsters, Castellio's, Beza's*, or any reformed Interpreter's Translation, than we wil submit to be judg'd and confin'd



by their *Trent Bible*, prodigiously decreed (under pain of being held accursed for presuming to do otherwise;) to be received for *Canonical Scripture*, above 40 years before it was extant, as Pope *Sixtus* the Vth set it forth, reviewed with his own Ey, and corrected by his own hand, in the year 1590. After which (at no greater distance than the end of two years) it was alter'd, in more than 2000 places, by Pope *Clement* the VIIIth (an admirable Argument of the Pope's *Infallibility*, no doubt) having still need enough and too much, of farther emendation, by the confession of Learned Papists themselves. †

† *Vid. Sixt. Aven. Anti-harb. Bib. lib. 1. cap. 12. § 3.*

What is then to be do'n in the Case supposed? Recourse must needs be had to the *Fountains of both Testaments*: According to which, if we speak not, How can we know *what we say, and whereof we affirm*? By what other means the mouths of vain Talkers and Deceivers may be stopped, Who can tell?

Being more than a lirl fond of an *Excellent Scholar's* Company, no Conversation pleasing me better, or as well: Why should my loathness to leav it seem strange, or my making no haste to get out of it be wondred at? Is not Sea and Land wont to be compassed to com at it? This I premise upon a foresight of my tarrying much longer on the *next difficulty* to be dissolved, resolved and removed if it can be (by whom sooner or better than an *Excellent Scholar*?) than my thoughts tel me can easily be avoided.

For if *one short word* hath held me all this while, How can a whole *hard Sentence* be sooner, or as soon dispatched; and the tru sense of it shewed, without more time bestowed in doing it?

And to make it appear, that it is not an impertinent *Scuff*, or unprofitable *Strife about Words to no purpose, much less to the Subversion of any Reader*, by persuading him to the belief of what wil do him hurt and not good: There is no need of saying more than this, That a *Mistranslation* of the next place to be examin'd, is apt to create a *wrong Opinion* of Almighty Power (which as one of our Liturgy-Collects tells us, delighteth chiefly to declare it self in shewing mercy and pity;) in a Readers minde, who believes such a false Translation to be tru.

To com as fast and soon as I can (who am more of kin to the *Slows* than *Hastings*; both which are the Names of som Families in England) to this *next piec of Work*, prepared for the exercise of an *Excellent Scholar*. Should I seriously speak to a Man of that Character (truly so called) of no fewer than 10000 faults, that may be found in the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Translations of the *Old Testament*; he would think I had used extraordinary diligence; in comparing those Versions with the Text to which they belong. Much more, if I tolde him of 50000 errors, that may be met with in our *Greek, Latin* and *English* Bibles. And what if I should add, That *all this* may be seen in the version of *no more than seven Words*? Would he take it for a *Rid*, and not know what I mean?



It is possible, that an *Excellent Scholar* indeed may have taken no notice of it. No Man ever did, or ever will be able to minde *all things* belonging to Learning. And I cannot tel who would have helped us to the Knowledge of it, if the *admirable Bochartus*, that great and curious *Observer*, had not do'n it. He, for any thing I know to the contrary; was the first, whom the common Translation of those *few Words* (no more than seven in number) that we have in 1 Sam. 6. 19. displeased.

The Words (that ought not to be rendred according to our English version: *He smote of the People Fifty thousand, and three-score and ten Men*) are these: *Vaisach ba'am sabb'im isch, khamischim eleph isch*. Which, without being wrested and turned out of course; transpos'd, misplac'd, and put out of order, contrary to all right and reason, against Grammar-Rules and Precepts, as needful here as any where to be observed, will never yield other English than this: *And he smote of (or among) the People seventy Men, fifty thousand Men*: (More than this, I say, cannot be made of those Words) without adding a *single Hebrew Letter* (frequently omitted in other places, where Interpreters have noted it to be both easy and necessary to be understood; tho' here it hath generally been over-looked. This singl Letter that I speak of, is *Mem*, which must be added to the Word *Eleph*, that signifies a thousand: And in answer to the sense of that Letter (when compounded with a Word that follows it) *in small a Word* as any in the English Tongue; *i. e.* the monosyllable *OF*: which will make the sense as complete and satisfactory as can be desired; besides rendring the Translation as tru as it ought to be. That is, thus:

*And he smote of the People Three-score and ten Men; fifty OF a thousand Men.*

Whereby we may see, that the three last Words, *khamischim eleph isch, fifty OF a thousand Men*, are *Exegetical* or *Expository* of the four first; being added to let the Reader understand *how many sinned, and how few suffered* for the offence committed: No more than a *20th part* of the Transgressors, being smitten for their presumption in making so over-holde with the Ark, as worthy of Death as the whole number of them was, if more than perished looked into it. For that may be doubred, as by what remains to be added, will appear.

Had it pleased the Lord to have smitten them all, *without sparing any at all* of the whole number that offended (supposing, at present, what will afterward, with good reason be contradicted: that is, that more sinned than those who suffered present Death;) his impartial severity (which who could have blamed?) had appeared: but in punishing but 70, (the 20th part of 1400) and sparing 1330, (if all were guilty of the Sin which those 70 suffered for; as is now, for a while, supposed, but not granted) Who can forbear to admire *the riches of his mercy*?

Much greater reason there would be to extol his goodness, if the right Reading were according to *Abbas Montanus*, *He smote of the People 70 Men of 50000*. (For then there had been 49930 let alone, when but 70

were made Examples of Divine Displeasure.) Which indeed is, in one respect at least, if not in several other, a more passable Translation, than the English, with the rest, (which speak of 30000, three-score and ten;) the order of the Words not being so confounded, and turned upsidedown by *this version*, as by our own, and many more it is.

But on other Considerations it is not probable: For who can think that a litle Town, or rather Village, according to *Josephus*, in the utmost Coast of *Judea*, was inhabited by so many *Myriads* of Men, as these Translations suppose to have lived there? Whose dead Bodies, if thousands survived them not, to take care of their Funerals, must have had no other Burying-place than the *Birds of the Air, and Beasts of the Earth* could provide.

For they were not Strangers, whom the fame of such unexpected good News as the return of the Ark was, had brought together; but the Men of *Beth-Shean* only, that were smitten for looking into it; as the place consulted will assure us, in not speaking a word of any concourse of the People thither, from any part of the Countrey, upon that occasion. On the contrary, we are there inform'd, that the Inhabitants of *Kiriath-Jearim*, (as neer Neighbors as they were) *came not* until after the Death of those 70 Men, and that too, not before they were sent for.

The Men, it is likely, who paid so dear for their Audacity, or overbolde Curiosity, were the *principal Men* of the place, who presumed, being the chief of all the Inhabitants there living; that if any body might have the privilege of prying into so sacred a Chest: it belonged to them especially, who by reason of their quality, ought to be satisfied with seeing it, before others approached to do the like.

Besides which, it is probable that they pressed forward together *all at once*, to beholde it; being every one afraid of coming too late (as in such cases is usual) and so perished together *in a lump, or cluster*.

For if the stroke of Divine Justice had fallen successively upon them, and not *at once*, who can give account of their stupidity in not taking notice of the bad success, which the first, and forwardest Intruders had, to deter them from doing like those Sufferers, for fear of faring no better?

— Πάδον δὲ τὸν ὄψιν ὅτι ἔγνω.

*Children themselves are wiser.* They fear the Rod which their Fellows have felt the smartness of, especially before their Faces, or in their Sight.

This makes it credible, that no more looked into the Ark than those *Threescore and ten Men*, who were punished with sudden Death for their presumption; tho' more were before supposed, but not granted to have sinned in like manner.

That this is the true sense of the place (which rightly understood, speaketh of no more than 70 that suffered Death, by the immediate Hand of that Holy God, whom the Men of *Beth-Shean* questioned, whether any



any body could stand before) may, if farther proof seems requisite, be thus made to appear.

In the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, there is, many times, (so often, that nothing is more frequent in those Divine Writings) an *Ellipsis*, Omission, or defect of a Letter, Word, or Words to be met with; which not only Reason, but Scripture it self teacheth us to supply, or fill up, when the sense of such a Word or Sentence, in which we finde it, is to be given.

Which Word or Words, so added, may be discerned in our own and other Translations, (as in all they ought to be distinguished) by a *distinct sort of Print*, or Character, that differs from what is, or should be answerable to the *Greek, Hebrew, or Chaldee Text*.

As in *Gen. 5. 3.* no more is said in the Hebrew Reading, than *Adam begate in his own likeness*, &c. But with good reason the Translators, after the Word *Begate*, (to make the sense the fuller) have added *A SON*, in a different manner of Letter; (and with good reason, I say; the name of that Son, who was *Seth*, being in the same Sentence expressed.)

So, *Gen. 10. 21.* we read *Unto Shem were CHILDREN born*; tho' the Hebrew Text saith no more than *Unto Shem ——— was born* [A Posterity;] or, *were born* [Sons and Daughters, or Children.] For *Bne*, a Nominative Plural, is joyned with *Zullad*, *Gen. 35. 26.*

And who knows how many other places of Scripture, the like Additions may be found in? For no body, I believe, ever numbred them.

And as Reason teacheth, so Scripture it self sheweth, that this supply of defective Words may, and must be made, to render the sense full. For Example: In *Exod. 3. 6.* we finde in Hebrew, no more than *I the God of thy Father*, &c. But in *Mat. 22. 32.* the Greek, more fully, saith *Ego eius*, &c. *I AM the God of*, &c.

So, *2 Sam. 6. 6.* it is only said *Uzza put forth to the Ark* — but *1 Chron. 13. 9.* the matter is more amply related, by telling the Reader, That he put forth *his hand* to holde or succour the Ark.

*I with Scorpions*, is all that we have, *2 Chron. 10. 11.*

But *1 Kin. 12. 11.* it is more to the full expressed, by repeating the Verb before-going; in saying, *I will chastise you with Scorpions*.

No more than, *Thy Servant hath found to pray before thee*, is expressed, in *1 Chron. 17. 23.* But in *2 Sam. 7. 27.* the sense is made more apparent, by saying, *Thy Servant hath found in his heart to pray*, &c. Thus *Dan. 9. 23.* we meet with no more than *Khamadorb atra*, i. e. *Thou desires*, (or much beloved.) But in *Dan. 10. 11. 19.* it is twice filled up, by adding the Word *Isch* to *Khamadorb*, and calling him *A Man of desires*.

In som of these places, we see the defect of a whole Word, or Words supplied. In other Passages, a bare Letter, and no more, is left out: The sense of which must be taken into the Paraphrase, and Interpretation of such defective Speeches, or the Bible of all other Books will be the most monstrous.

Such.



Such a multitude of other Absurdities, besides the Popish and Lutheran Dreams of *Accidents without a Subject*, and *A Subject without Accidents*, must then be admitted, that the like were never heard of, nor can elsewhere be found.

A Man would then be *A Bird*, Psal. 11. 1. *A Beast*, and that as big as an Elephant, if *Behemoth* so signifies, Psal. 73. 22.) *A Lyon's Whelp*, *A strong Ass*, *A Serpent*, *An Adder*, *A Hinde*, *A fruitful Bough*, Gen. 49. 9, 14, 17, 21, 22. *A Head of Golde*, Dan. 2. 38. *A God*, Exod. 7. 1. As strange a thing as *Protem*; as monstrous as a *Centaur*, and as odd as *Chimera*, or whatever *Poetical Fiction* seems odder, if any doth. A Man's Tongue would be *a Pen*; (Psal. 45. 2.) his Teeth, the *Teeth of Lyons*, (Joel 1. 6.) Fire would be *Salt* (Mark 9. 49.) God a *Fire*, (Deut. 4. 24.) and the *Chaldeans* who worshiped that Element of Nature, no Idolaters. *All Flesh* would be *Grass*; (Esa. 40. 6.) and all Christian People *A Loaf of Bread*, 1 Cor. 10. 17.

Who can reckon half the absurd, and false Propositions that may be fetched out of Scripture, unless this defective way of Speaking and Writing is understood, with liberty granted to make the sense fair and clear, (intelligible, possible and passable) by adding *a Letter*, or *Word* sometimes, more than is expressed?

As in all the places pointed at, in these last Examples, the Letter *Chaph* (which in Hebrew is a note of comparison, called by *Grammarians Chaph hadimjon*, and is answerable to *AS* in English;) being left out, the sense, without it, is worse than obscure, dark, or doubtful: But as soon as we ad it, all difficulty is removed, and no room for any Objection remains. A Man, in some respect or other, being *AS a Bird, or Beast*; *AS a Lyon's Whelp*, or whatever Thing or Creature he is compared to in those Holy Writings.

This is a Rule of such force and use, as not only answers the Argument, by which some have labored to establish the *Notion of a created God*, fetched

† Where, if *Elohim*, God, stands not for *Chelohim*, *AS* God: *Lelohim*, For a God, or instead of God, as Exod. 4. 16. or for *Talpath Elohim*, in God's room, or place; as by Gen. 30. 2. Gen. 50. 19. compared, We may farther expound it: Who knows how *Adoss*, a Man, could be a God to *Pharaoh*?

from Exod. 7. 1. † but renders those miserably mistaken, and unreasonably controverted Words: *This is my Body* (Mat. 26. 26.) as easy to be understood as can be desired. Which being thus sensed and understood, as a hundred other places of Holy Scripture needs must be; will be subject to none of these Objections and Absurdities, that the popish, pretended meaning of them meets with.

And it is not easy, if possible, to relate how much Blood had been spared; how many Lives saved; Tortures, Murders, and Massacres prevented, by the seasonable Application of this Rule to those three or four Words, the mis-understanding of which hath been the Cause of more mischief, than can easily, I say, if at all be tolde,

tolde, in as ample a manner as becoms the occasion. For the Men of Rome (not heeding, or not regarding the *Ride* that I speak of, but understanding the controverted Words as absurdly and contrary to all sense and reason, as if there were no difference between a proper and *Figurative Speech*, which is spoken by way of similitude, or likeness in som respects only :) have kill'd and destroyed Thousands, and *Miryads*, if not *Millions* of better People than themselves by Ten thousand degrees, (in *France*, *Flanders*, *England*, *Holland*, and all Countreys where their Power hath prevailed) for not receiving and admitting their absurd and unreasonable Interpretation of a Speech, in which there is nothing harder to be understood than in many other of our Saviour's Sayings, which they make no scruple of expounding otherwise than according to the common, literal meaning of his Words; for fear of being forced to maintain that He is, in a proper sense *A Door*, *A Lamb*, *A Shepherd*, *A Vine*, or whatsoever else he thought fit to compare himself to.

But it is not the defect of a *Chaph*, or omission of the Note of comparison, AS; but the lack of the Letter MEM, signifying OF, which must be supplied, to help us to the right sense of *Khamischim Bloph*, (barely Translated 30000, and not 50 OF a Thousand, as it ought to be;) which I have not yet ended with.

So that *admirable Man*, before-prais'd, hath resolved it; giving several Examples of the like Speeches, in other Parts of Scripture. As *aloth* for *Me' aloth*, Exod. 16. 12. i. e. *Take heed to go up, for beware of going up*. *Schesh*, fine twined Linnen, (Exod. 36. 8.) for *Misschesh* OF fine, twined Linnen. And (which he omits) in the same place, *Ma'aseh khescheb*, Cunning Work, for *Minma'aseh*, OF such Work. For more instances of the same sort, he refers us to the 19th, 34th and 35th. v. of the same Chapter.

In like manner *Oiebbav*, Their Enemies, stands for *Me'iebbav*, OF their Enemies, *Josh*. 10. 13. *Bethlehem*, for OF *Bethlehem*, 2 *Sam*. 23. 24. *Shepharvaim* for *Mishepharvaim*, 2. *Kin*. 17. 24. as the *Masorites* there note in the Margin, that it ought to be read.

The like defect of the Letter *Mem* (or preposition *Min*, which it stands for, in composition with another Word) signifying OF, or *From*, must here be admitted, before any tolerable Translation of the place can be made without turning the Words *In-and-Out*, or putting them so out of order as is not to be endur'd.

There is not in the Hebrew Text of this controverted place (which I have not yet ended with) any *Vau*, or conjunction *Copulative*, waiting upon, and uniting the greater and less number; (that is 70, which are first named, with 50000, that com after;) yet this without need, and against reason, is added by the Interpreters now spoken of.

Much rather should the other Letter, so often found wanting, have been taken in, as in all the places above-named, it is.



To this let me add, That *this* again they have do'n, Gen. 15. 2. where *Dammasek*, Damascus, stands for *Middamasek*, OF *Damascus*.

Was there not as much caus to think that *Khamischim Eleph*, 50000, here stood for *Khamischim M-eleph*, 50 OF a thousand?

How else can all the Absurdities hitherto named, with the rest that remain to be spoken of, be avoided?

Once I thought, (while my minde was intent, on the matter which I have not yet expressed all my thoughts of) That the greater number, in Scripture-computation, stil goes before the less; as often it doth, according to the Original Order of the Words, Gen. 5. 5. Gen. 6. 3. Num. 1. 21, 23. and many times more, in that Chapter, as in Jer. 32. 28, 29, 30. and frequently elsewhere.

But the thing examin'd, it was not long e'r the contrary appeared, in Gen. 5. 10, 11, 13, 14, 17. and in Exod. 12. 40.

Which made me wonder to finde it delivered for lirl, if any thing less than a Rule, by a late Learned Translator of, and Commentator upon the

*Pentateuch*, that the manner of the Hebrews, in counting, is to set † *Units* before *Tens*.

And it could not but seem strange, that both *Drusius* and *Bochartus*, should insist upon it as a thing unquestionable; tho' too different, or rather, contrary purposes. *Drusius* to justify the Translations, which affirm that no fewer than 50000, &c. were smitten. Which however he confessed, could not be do'n without the addition of *Vau*, AND, A *Conjunction Copulative*, which is not in the Text, to binde both numbers together. ||

The other Learned Man makes it an Argument against the truth of such a Translation, That the smallest number is first named according to the order of the Words, as we finde them in the Hebrew Text.

For the greater number, according to his Opinion, ought to go before the less. Which in Scripture, he adds, is as constantly observed, as in other Languages. †

But as this Argument is not valid, (as hath been shewed, by pointing at several Places, where the least number is first named;) so there is no need of it, to overthrow the truth of those terrible Translations, which make more Men to have perished at *Beis-Shemesh*, than the place, probably, yielded.

For if a Letter at least, confessedly on both sides, is defective, and must needs be added, to make the sense intelligible: it is much more reasonable, That the Letter MEM (signifying OF) should be supplied, than

† *Uicirates Decadibus praeponere solent* (Hebraei.) *Jo. Cler. ad Gen. 3. 24.*

|| *Tò (1) subauditur ante ׀שון & numerus minor, ut fit, praeponitur. Drus. apud Polam ad loc.*

† *Vocum ordo erit plane inversus. Debeant enim millenarii praecedere numeros inferiores. Quod in Scriptura perpetuum aequae ac in linguis nostris. Dicendum itaque fuisset, 50 milia, & 70. Bochart apud Polam, ibid.*



than that VAU ( AND ) should be taken in : several Examples where the former is *omitted* in the Text, but *admitted* by Interpreters, having been given; and none at all brought to shew, that the other ought to take place.

As last reason there is to except against the repetition of the Word *Isch* (Men) that is *twice* met with in the Original Text, tho' but *once* translated, in the *English* and other Versions; And was thought, by this great Linguist superfluously used, more than once.

For the like anomalous Word (*Schanah*) is often repeated, with no more need than this, *Gen. 5. 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14. Exod. 12. 40.* with other places where another such *pleonasm*, or redundancy of Speech, may be met with, in this Language; as in the different dialects of it is common.

Much better I approve his *4th Reason*, wherewith he opposeth the common Translation. Which is *the no probability* of the Lord's dealing so severely with a People, who shewed themselves so joyful and thankful, when the Ark was brought back, as the former part of that Chapter relates, at the 13, 14, 15. v.

It is said indeed, at the 19th. v. That *the People lamented, because the Lord had smitten many of the People, with a great slaughter.*

But the Word MANY is added to the Text, without need; nothing there being answerable to it; (To make the number of 50000 look the likelier, it was probably added.) And without it, the Death of no more than Three-score and ten, might wel be called a great Slaughter, considering *when* it hapened, *i. e.*

1. On a day of rejoycing, whereby their mirth was turned into mourning.

2. Out of *what* number they were taken away. From no more than 1400, which the Town of *Beth-Sheanesh* might wel yield. Much more probably than 50000, as before-shewed.

3. *What manner* of Men they were. The prime, or chief of the place, as hath been consider'd. In all which respects, it might wel be called *A great Slaughter.*

For if, after this, when none but *Uzzab* was smitten with sudden Death, for presuming to touch the Ark, which, not being consecrated for such a Service, he ought not to have do'n: *David* was so troubled, that he desisted from his design of bringing the Ark to his own House and City, for the space of 3 Months, for fear of som farther punishment, which *the lack of due Order* might occasion (2 Sam. 6. 9, 10, 11. 1 Chron. 15. 13.) How much greater caus had the People of *Beth-Sheanesh* to lament the loss of so many, out of *so few* in comparison? For *all Israel were assembled*, when King *David* went to fetch it (2 Sam. 6. 5.) and *but one* of them

lost :

lost: but here 50 of a thousand (*i. e.* a 20th part) were taken away; and was not that a great Slaughter?

What the Syriac and Arabic Interpreters intended, by turning *Khamischim* into *Kahmeſch* (answerable to which they have *khamsſho* and *khamsfato*, † having exchanged the plural 50, for the singular 5, and thereby made the number of them that lost their lives, 45000 fewer than other Translators; Who can be sure?

† *Wamko Morjo be'ammo khamsſho alpin Weſhab'in gabbrin.* Syr. *i. e.* And the Lord smote among the People 5000 and 70 Men. *Wadaraba - rrabbo - ſſjaaba Wamata mibum khamsfato alpin Waſab'owna reſolan.* Arab. *i. e.* And the Lord smote the People, and there died of them 5000 and 70 Men.

It may seem, that they purposed to render the History credible by diminishing the number.

But who can confidently affirm it? However it came to pass, their Translation can carry no Authority against the Original History, which hath 50 and not 5. Not 50000 however, but 50 OF a thousand, is the sense of

the place; as with much greater reason than can be given for the other Versions, it ought to be rendred.

Otherwise nothing hath all this while been prov'd, or advanc'd.

Whether it was not reasonable to omit the Letter MEM belonging to *Eleph*, for the speedier and easier reading and speaking, (which is helped by avoiding the concurrence of two such Letters so close together; one in the end of the word immediately preceding, another in the beginning of this;) Let those who can best judge of such matters determin.

And if any thing worth the hearing, in opposition to what hath been said against the common Interpretation, of this and that other place of *Exod. 12. 9.* can be offer'd by this Excellent Scholar; I am willing to be better inform'd.

But if his *Garner* (which by this time, one would think, should be full enough to afford, if not all manner of *Store*, like that which is spoken of, *Pſal. 144. 13.* yet a far greater plenty than can reasonably be expected, from those who never had the like opportunity of being so replenish'd;) yields nothing fit to be brought forth: I advise him again, having intimated som such thing before, to beware of

¶ In another sense than is here intended, I know not whether ever he did, or can do it; being far enough however, from ascribing as much to it, as som are wont to do, for reasons not here to be produced.

talking more without Book ¶ than he findes or understands within Book; for fear of falling under a necessity of holding and defending an Error; or of being compel'd to confess, that he took upon trust what he ought to have tried; but for want of skill or will, neglected to do it.

If he findes himself able to defend, or if that cannot be, can tel how to amend those other places, before pointed at; it will not be too hard for him to maintain,



rain, or alter for the better, the translation of *Judg.* 10. 8. which saith That the *Philistins* &c. (who are spoken of v. 7th) **THAT YEAR** vexed and oppressed the Children of *Israel* 18 Years.

For the *Colon* put between the word *Israel* and *Eighteen*, will not do the business; (there being no ground for it in the *Hebrew Text*, any more than there is to put the *same stop* at the 3d *Hebrew* and the 5th *English* word of the Bible, thus: *In the beginning God created:* Which would utterly spoil the sense of the whole Verse. A verb *transitive* must not be so divided from the *Case* that ought to follow it more closely.) And I make no question but that the *Latin* Version of the *Chaldee Paraphrast* is as wrong as the *English* translation of the original words, in rendring *Beshatto habi, In illo anno.* For *Be* being a preposition of many senses, among divers other, it signifies *From*, as well as *In*, according to *Drusius*. † And that this was the meaning of the *Paraphrast*, we may judge by the *Greek*, *Syriac*, & *Arabic* Versions.

At that time, saith the *Septuagint*. \* i. e. during the oppression of the *Philistins*, &c. which continued 18 Years.

So the *Syriac*. † *From that Year, 18 Years.* And in like Manner the *Arabic*: *From that Year until the eighteenth Year.* ||

Thus the sense is as clear and intelligible as needs to be wished.

But how they should be vexed and oppressed 18 Years, in one Year, who can understand?

I beseech his *Excellent Scholarship* to accept of what hath now been offered for his better information, that he may nor hereafter take *Non-sense* and *Contradictions* for *Scripture*, as illiterate, vulgar Readers use to do, not knowing when they are *in*, or when *our*: (let him therefor take this in good part :) or produce something better.

Which if he can do, I will give him more thanks than ever he received thousands (*per annum* sometimes, if I mistake not) out of the Churches store, for no body knows what.

To name but one or two, or at most but a few places more, of many other at hand; or which may, without much *Adoe*, be brought together:

Let me ask what he thinks of *King Solomon*? Whether he was, as our *English* translation calls him (*1 Kings* 3. 7.) *A lisl Childe*, when he made that Prayer which God was so pleas'd with, that he gave him *much more*, than he asked?

For his Father *King David*, before that time, called him *A wise Man*; (*1 Kings* 2. 9.) And before he had Reigned *forty Years*, he is said to have been *Old*. *1 K.* 11. 4.

Which shews that he began not his Reign in his *Child-hood*. And what

† De lit. Mos. vecal. cap.

7. *In, propter, de, ex, per, contra, super, inter.*

\* *Ev τῷ χρόνῳ ἐκείνῳ.*

LXX.

† *Men boi shasho, thamona 'ofora shanin. Ab illo anno octodecim annos.*

|| *Mit-tilka-ssanati ilai thamaniyati 'esjarata senatan. Ab illo anno usque ad annum decimum octavum.*

is no less considerable, is *Thar Na'ar*, the name which he givs himself, in the place pointed at, is applied to *Joseph* when 30 Years old; *Gen. 41. 12, 46.* To *Joshua*, (*Exod. 33. 11.*) when 55 at least; & or rather more, he neer 40 Years † *adum Johan. Cleric. ad* before the time there spoken of, having been loc. a *Warrior* and *Conqueror*. (*Exod. 17. 13.*) To *Absalom*, (*2 Sam. 18. 5.*) who lacked *Grace* more than *Age* when he acted the part of A Rebel and Traytor against his King and Father, so seemingly religiously, that few of his many followers, since those days, have out do'n him. *Joab's* Armor-bearers were question less, *no little Children*, tho' called *Ne'arim*. *2 Sam. 18. 15.* Nor was *Benjamin* A *minorite* of this sort, when his brother *Judab* named him *Na'ar*, (*Gen. 43. 8.*) being but 7 Years Yonger than *Joseph*, and the *Father* of several *Children* at that time. *Gen. 46. 21.*

Why then should he be named *The Lad*, (*Gen. 43. 8.*) and not rather *The Yong Man*, as *Absalom*, in the place before-expressed, is called? much less was *puerulus*, *parvulus*, a fit title for him. *Gen. 44. 20.*

It should rather have been said, *The least*, or *yongest*; As *Ben haktan* is a yonger son, *Gen. 9. 94.* *Ben katan* A yong Son, *2 Sam. 9. 12.* and *Akbi haktan* a yonger brother, *Judg. 1. 13.* Which makes it evident that *Na'ar* alone, without an *Adjective* joyned with it, to fix and determin the sense, doth not certainly signify such a *Childe* as in several places of *Scrip-ture* is called *Na'ar katan*, and not otherwise Englished, *1 K. 11. 17. 2 K. 5. 14. Esth. 11. 6.* as *Ne'arim ketanim*, are *lirl Children*, *2. K. 2. 23.*

*Na'ar* and *Zaken*, are *yong* and *old*, *Esth. 3. 13.* where the name of a *lirl Childe* is *Taph*; which is frequently the term, when but one word is used to expresse these *lirl ones*; (*Gen. 34. 29. 43. 8. 46. 5. Ezek. 9. 6.*) being derived, as som of the Learned in these Matters,

haved judged, from the Arabic طف; from whence coms *Taphphaton*, that signifies a *smal, weak, imperfect thing*.

Was this admirable King such a one, *yong* tho' he was? Which is all that *Na'ar* commonly means, when it stands alone.

Commonly I say, because I forget not that *Moses* calls himself *Na'ar* (barely so, and no more,) when he was but *thres Months old*. *Exod. 2. 6.*

Much more frequently, as all the Examples before-given testify, it signifies those that are *much elder*.

In the last place, (unless I change my present purpose; being loath to giv this Excellent Scholar the trouble of traveling farther on this *crabbed Road*, as if custom hath not made it familiar to him, it must need seem;)

I desire to know of him, What the *Fat of the kidneys of wheat*, *Deut. 32. 14.* means

For what *kidneys* hath *Wheat*? And what *Fat* appertains to those *kidneys*, if any it hath?

There's



There's A sort of pulse, which for likeness sake is called *A kidney-bean*. But what kinde of Wheat is *so* shaped? Who ever beheld a grain of that choice Corn formed after such a fashion?

What the *finest* or *choicest* flour of wheat is, who knows not? But who can tell what the *kidneys* of wheat are? For there is not outward likeness enough between wheaten grains and the *kidneys of Animals*, to make so smal a similitude the ground of the phrase, as in Hebrew it is expressed by *khelebb chiloth khittab*. But as the kidneys of living creatures *ly hid*, and are out of sight, until their bodies are opened, or dissected: So the *flour* of wheat being inclosed in the husk, (or branny part of the grain) is conceal'd, or hidden from the ey, before it is bruised or grinded.

Thence the meaning of those 3 words, cannot quickly, if at all, be better rendred in Latin, than by *Tenui* (or according to *Castellio*, *pingui*) *flor Tritici*; i. e. the choice or fine flour of wheat.

For the fattest parts of Animals are the *thinnest*, *finest*, and *choicest*. But that *khelebb*, tho it primarily signifies *Fat*, or *Fatness*, is not there to be taken in it's properest sense; is manifest by the Nature of Wheat, to which no such thing belongs; and by the better translation of the term, in *Psal.* 81. *ult.* where *khelebb khittab* is rendred, not the *Fat*, but *finest* of the Wheat.

Which agrees to the *Chaldee paraphrase*, that expresseth it by *Tobb lekhem*, i. e. goodness, or *finest* of bread.

So again it is englished, *Psal.* 147. 14.

Why should it here be otherwise rendred? especially, without a marginal note pointing at the proper sense of the word *khelebb*, as in both those places of the *Psalms* we have it.

Envy it self must needs confels, if not admire the great learning and industry of a foreign Author, who hath lately helped us to a new Latin Version of the *Pentateuch*, with a *Paraphrase* and *Annotations*. However, I cannot subscribe to his interpretation of those words, (in the place of *Deuteronomy*, now spoken of:) *Ve'attudim'im khelebb chiloth khittab*. Which he renders, *Hircos cum adipe renim ET triticum comedisti*, i. e. Thou hast eaten Goats, with the fat of kidneys AND Wheat.

To this translation I cannot agree, for several reasons.

1. Because he changeth the third person, *Tochal*, he did eat, (or that he might eat;) which must be supplied out of v. (13th, *and xou're*.) for the second, *Tochal* (Thou didst eat, or hast eaten;) without any need or reason besides that of making it answerable to *Tischth* (*Bibisti*, Thou didst drink,) in the next words. Which is no sufficient ground for such an alteration; the *third* person only being used in that whole 13th v, which this part of the 14th hath dependence on.

Moses

Moses indeed, in his next words (*And thou didst drink the pure blood of the grape,*) changeth the person, as in other places of Scripture is wont to be do'n : but 'tis one thing for the *Speaker* himself so to alter the person in the Text ; and another for an *Interpreter* to bring so great a change into the Text.

Which is greater liberty than a Reader who knows what belongs to the matter, hath need to allow, or ought to give way to.

2. He omits the Conjunction copulative in *Ve'attudim*, (which ought to be translated, not being here redundant, or superfluous;) saying *Goats* only, not *And goats* ; and adds it to *khittah*, *Wheat*, where it is not wanting. For that *khittah* is not there in the *Accusative* but *Genitive Case*, is manifest by *chiloth*, the word before it. Which is not (as Grammarians speak, in *statu absoluto* but *constructo*, i. e.) to be joyned in construction with any but the word that comes after it.

For if *Adeps renum*, the fat of kidneys, as distinct from wheat, and not belonging to it, had been spoken of, the words would have been *khelebb chelaioth* ; unless he would construe it thus : *vechiloth attudim in khelebb*, *Et renes hircorum cum adipe*, i. e. The kidneys of Goats with fat. Which as he hath not do'n, so if another should do it, there would be such a monstrous transposition of the words as is not again to be met with in the whole Bible ; where the *Noun regent*, or governing, alway stands so related to the governed, as is three or four times to be seen in this one period.

3. By naming *Wheat* alone, without *fatness*, that is, *finess* added to it, he hath reb'd it of that due praise which ought not to be taken from it. For the *Kine*, *Sheep* and *Lambs* are commended, by expressing the most choice increase which they yield. (*Butter*, *Milk*, and *Fat*.) The *Rams* and *Goats* are not ordinary ; but of the breed of *Basban*. Which is no less than to say, the most excellent. So the *Wheat*, in all reason, (in conformity to what went before,) deserved to be extold (as in the Text it is, what ever becomes of this or any translation that neglecteth to do it,) for the goodness of it ; no less here, than in both those *Psalms*, 81. ult. 147. 14.

That which is therefor signified by *Chiloth* Kidneys, belongs to *khittah*, *Wheat*, and not to *Attudim*, *Goats*. Which needed not again to be commended, after they had been sufficiently well spoken of before, in being joyned with *Rams of Basban*.

If other grain had been named, *Wheat* alone had implied an Excellency above it, tho' barely spoken of, without any addition of the *fine flour* which it yields.

But this single sort of grain being only mention'd, it was fit that the choicest part of it should be spoken of, to make it fit Company for those other precious things with which it is joyned.

*Buxtorf*, on the word *chelaioth*, understands by *Pinguedo renum Tritici*, i. e. The fat of the kidneys of *Wheat* (as our Translators call it,) the best and



and fullest Wheat; which hath Grains that rise up round, and are filled out, as the Kidneys of Fat, healthy Sheep, or other *Animals* are wont to be. †

But most Readers not being able to reach that meaning of the Phrase, without an Explanation (the lack of which makes it sound oddly;) it seems far better to translate the *sense only*, and not the *proper English* of the Words, strictly taken; as in the Psalms before-mention'd is don.

† Optimum & crassissimum triticum, cujus genicula exuberant ad formam Renum.

And if *Khelebb* Fatness, is no less ascribed to *Corn* and *Wine*, than to *Oyl*, *Numb.* 18, 12. and two or three times rendred by the Word *BEST*, in that place; Why should none but the proper sense of the term, be here given?

Will this *Excellent Scholar* now say, That I have wronged the Text, abused the common English Translation, or that Learned Man's *new Versions*, which with all these Reasons (neither begd nor borrow'd, but digd out of a Ground which no *Church-Man*, of any Man, especially if extold for *excellency of Scholarship*, ought to be a Stranger to) hath now been oppos'd?

Let him shew it, if he can.

But if he is not a *competent*, to forbear saying an *excellent* Judge of such matters, I will not give a *pin of a penny a hundred*, for his excellency in I know not what other part of Learning, without this (for I never yet heard wherein it consisteth) let who will cry it up.

For what service, in the absence of this, can it here do?

That is questionless, the most excellent, which is the *most useful* and needful sort of Learning for a professed Teacher.

Especially for one that expecteth and receiveth the Reward of *double Honour*. Who but such a one should use *double diligence*; first in attaining, afterward in exercising the skil he hath gotten?

For to borrow the Words of a *well-learned*

Bishop, †

† Bish. Jux. in a Sermon on 1 Pet. 4. 11.

This [to speak as becometh the Oracles of

God, and teach the Knowledge of them;]

is our Office. This we take upon us; this we profess; and except we do this, we do nothing. It is not enough for us to know I cannot tell what Learning. The Devils peradventure know more than any of us all. It belongeth to a Pastor, not so much to have learned many things, as to have taught much.

But there have been, and I make no scruple of saying, there are a *sort of Churchmen*, that will neither do it themselves (and I greatly suspect, are not as qualified for the purpose as they need to be;) nor suffer others that would, when it is in their power to hinder them; as too often it hath been, and too much is.

Som of this Number and Character, are, I doubt not, of the *Abbot's* Minde, in *Erasmus*, † that would not have his Monks too busie with Books, becaus he found the most Learned of that Tribe, minus morigeros, least governable. [I believ so, when one that understood not the *Art of governing*, would be Governor; and affected, without the skil of ruling to be made a Ruler.] They would argu the Case with him, out of the Decrees of Popes and Councils; out of *Peter and Paul*, who taught he knew not what. And he loved not a disputing Monk; [No; the Man, without doubt, was fitter to play with a *Monkey*] or that any whom he govern'd should be wiser than himself.

But, in the process of the *Colloquy*, a wiser than he tolde him, That his best way of avoiding that trouble, was to study and take pains to be as wise as the wisest of'em all, and wiser, if possible.

Which whosoever hath do'n, or is willing to do, wil, I make no doubt, promote and favor the like Study and Industry, where he findes it; being sensible of the trouble that is needful to be undergo'n, before any tolerable Progress can be made.

I know not what time this *Gentleman* hath bestowed to attain his *Excellency of Learning*, any more than I can tel, or ever was tolde what his *Talent* is.

But if he is not qualified to say something worth the hearing, about the Translation of the Texts above named (to which I question, not his ability of adding many more, if a faculty of examining these is not wanting;) I wil nor, in the next place, presume to giv him counsel, how to bestow his time for the future, but refer him to the advice of as able a Judge of the case, as can any where that I know be found, or needs to be sought.

I mean the ingenious *Christian Rawin*, of *Berlin*, who knew more of the matter that he wrote of (than is generally understood) by conversation among People, who spake the Language, with its different Dialects, which he taught the knowledge of.

To omit how often this great *Linguist* chargeth Translations with nonsense, and falsehood; not forbearing the *English*, but expressing it by name: † I wil

[Part 1st pag. 196, 197, of his *general Grammar* for Hebrew, Chaldee, &c. I finde in his Discourse of the *Eastern Tongues* (Pag. 34.) Where having praised God for

such Riches as have flowed out of half-stopt-wels (he means Translations of the Bible, with Annotations;) forthwith he proceeds to complain, that

By ignorance of the tru nature of the Tongues, and signification of the Words, in *Hebrew*, *Chaldee*, &c. There is not a Verse in the Bible, but may be made more clear and plain than hitherto; and never a Chapter



ter in the Bible wherein there are not *very gross and foal faults*, even in the English Translation.

Then, directing his Speech to the Clergy, he goes on thus:

Tel me not what other Men did, or do know; but tel me what you know? Not that *others* Preach out of the Text, but that *you* do it. It is not enough to say, In the *Ebrev* it is so and so: It affordeth this or that *Sense, Doctrin, Admonition, Use, Reproof, Argument, Connexion, Disjunction*; this or that *Number, Gender and Person*: This, or that larger Explication, becaus of the more large Signification of the Words in my Text; [it will not suffice, to say this] and that with a confidence, when the Auditors, for the most part, know that it is *but borrowed Work*, and that upon hear-say, (not upon tru, judicial Knowledge;). [they that make this Show of understanding the Original Text] many times not knowing so much as the names of the Letters; much less how to read. And your conscience wil tel you, That if the *dawning* hath such a Grace in your Sermons, the *day-light* wil be exceeding more gracious. Fear not; if our ignorance hath do'n much good by other Mens Knowledge, but that your Knowledge wil do more. And therefore stir up your selves to such Holy, Necessary, Sweet, Comfortable, Living, Spiritual, Good Work. Let us not be drowsy, when God calls for labor and watching. Why wil we sleep, when even the sleep [which we break not off] wil bring us to the danger of Eternal Plagues. A Watchman must be vigilant, must know the Language of his *General*; be able to receiv and give it, discovering whether it be counterfeited by an Enemy, or the tru *Morton*. All our Virtues consist in *Actions*, not *Wishes*. Would to God (you may say) I had learned it when I was yong. Tru; but now you are a Minister of his Word, ye must learn it of necessity. When ye were yong, you *might* have learn'd it, but now you *must*. Then it was easy, but now profitable: then delight-som; now reason wil sweeten it. Then it would have recommended your *Ingenium*, but now your *Officium*. Then Memory was strong, but now the Pleasure of God more rying. Then the Knowledge, or at least the Study of it, would have been honourable before Men; but now is the ignorance shameful. Then you did not understand it; but now ye do see the necessity. If you did not learn it in your Youth, you were, I am sure, careless; but now not learning it, you are inexcusable. Nor Age, nor Reason, nor Necessity, nor Office, nor Men, nor God, nay, nor your own Conscience can excuse you.

Hitherto you have read the Words of a *great Linguist*.

That which he wrote, with no less fervency than the occasion called for, (He was well aware, we may gather from his manner of Writing, how culpable it isto be *colde* in so good a Cause;) was so far from being this one learned Man's *singular* Opinion, that such as are no Strangers to the Subject he wrote of, know nothing better, than that many *Popish Authors* themselves as well as Protestant Writers of great fame and note, have judg'd it *no less*

needful for the right understanding of the Old and New Testament, to know the Languages in which they were written, than this Man hath declared it to be.

Of this number were *Reuchlin, Erasmus, Steuchus Eugubinus, Arias Montanus, Oleaster, Mafius, Cajetan, Bellarmine, Alphonsus Mendoza, Martinus, Marsennus, Serarius, Villavincensius, and Andradius*, among others of the Roman Communion. And if Protestant Authors have not labored more abundantly than these and others of that way; they must not however be denied the Commendation of having labored with both hands, to promote so needful a Study, in the *Schools of the Prophets*, and among the Candidates of Divinity especially.

For who can relate half the excellent things they have spoken and written to stir up to it, or express the Complaints they have made to finde it so neglected among the Reformed, as in too many places it is, while not only *Jesuits*, and other Churchmen among the *Romanists*, but *Lay-men* likewise, have spared no cost, or pain to attain it?

Were there nothing else in it but what moved *Barnes*; the famous School-man to learn Ebrew in *extrema senectute*, when the Title of a *very old Man* belonged to him, [for which he gave this and no better reason, That *Heretics*, as he called more Orthodox Men than himself, might no longer laugh at him for lack of it:] tho' that is as small an Argument as can be offer'd in so grand a case; yet som, I believ, will be more affected with it, and sooner persuaded by it to begin the neglected Study, than induced by better *Motives*: I mean, To avoid the contempt (not of sober, learned Men, who rather pity, than deride the defect of this Knowledge, but when they meet intolerable insolence and ignorance, looking as big as if it were rather a matter of boasting; or ground of glorying, than what a Man ought to be ashamed of: not only to avoid the contempt of such Men, I say, but the scorn) of *Women and Children* themselves; among whom there have been and are, such as are not strangers to this skill. Without which the most Learned in other Matters, knows no more how to deal with a *late Learned Adversary*, in different respects, than he knows how to stand without Feet, walk without Legs, or fight without Hands.

For I wonder how any Man, if he knows no farther than a *Latin* or *Greek* Translation of the Bible, can prevent his being robd of as pregnant a proof of our Savior's *Divinity* or *Deity*, as can be, or needs to be produced. That I mean, which we meet with, in *Jer. 23. 6.*

Where the name *Jehovah* (so proper to God, that it cannot belong to any but him, whose name alone it is, *Psal. 83. ult.*) being ascribed to him in that high and mighty Title, which calls him *Jehovah Tsidkenu*, the LORD (or *Jehovah*) our Righteousness: There are som too curious and inquisitive, as well as over-acute Disputants about *Articles of Faith* (which I take to be sufficiently proved, when made appear to be *Divine Revelations*) as if they purposed to be wise above that which is written, 1. Cor. 4. 6.)



4. 6.) that would subtilly wrest, nor to say sacrilegiously exhort it from us, becaus *Jerusalem*, in another place of this Prophet, is dignified with the same Title; being also called *Jehovah Thikenu*, if *Jer. 33. 16.* is rightly Translated. Yet no body, they tel us, ever took *Jerusalem* (whether the place, or People there dwelling, is understood by that Word) to be God.

Thus indeed it is, according to the last, but in this and som other places, worst *English* Translation; the Words which we finde, in the Chapter and Verse before-named, being these: *In those days, Judah shall be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: And this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The LORD our Righteousness.*

What wil he now say to this Unitarian Exception, or Objection, † (he I mean) † which I finde in a whom the Prophe's Words, are as the words pretended *Accurate Edition* of a Book that is Sealed, which cannot be read nation of the principal Texts, (much less understood) becaus he is not learn- usually alledged for the Divinity of our Savior, pag. ed, tho' the Book is open'd, and the place pointed at? And how wil it be possible for 13. Col. 1. But so far him to defend the Scripture from contradict- from being accurate as a curs- ing it self? sory Rapsody can be, or an Adversary needs to wish or desire.

For if God's Name alone is *Jehovah* (*Psal. 83. ult.*) How can *Jerusalem* be called *Jehovah Thikenu*, to speak of no other absurdity than that of applying so Holy and Reverend a Name to a City, the Work of Man's hands, or a People who were but *Jehovah's* Workmanship.

Not to leav this Objection unanswered, let the Prophet's Words be scann'd; In which there is not a Word or Syllable answerable to those four words of our Translation — *Is the name wherewith* — but the needless and groundless Addition of those Words to the Text, makes the meaning of it darker and harder to be found out, than without them it would be.

The most Plain, Clear, Grammatical Interpretation of these four or five Words (in which the difficulty that Mis-translation only hath caused, consisteth) is this: *And he that shall call her, is the LORD our Righteousness*; the Prophet's Words being these: *Vezeb ascher-jikra-lab, &c.* which thus rendred, make the *English* exactly answerable to the Hebrew, and express the whole matter in a few Words and Letters almost, as the Prophet spake and wrote it.

So it was Englished in the Bible allowed to be read in Churches, in Queen Elizabeth's time, and after her Reign was ended. Much better than the last Translation hath it, as I finde upon trial, by comparing this with the like forms of Speech, in many other places of Scripture.

Of which sort are these? *Kirten lo*. Call him. *Exod. 2. 20.*  
*Kra lastounamish bazzork*. Call this Shunamite. *2 Kings 3. 12.*  
*Kra-lab, vajikra-lab*. Call her; and he called her. *2 Kings 4. 15.*  
*Al rikrens li*, &c. Call me not Naomi; *Krena li*, &c. Call me Mara.  
*Ruth 1. 20.*

Agreeable to these, many other translations of the Verb *Kara*, he called, with a *Dative Case* after it, may be met with.

Which Verb, when it hath not a *Nominative* belonging to it, expressed, (like many other, in the language now spoken of,) signifies *impersonally*, and is so to be understood (if we would not miss the right meaning of it,) however we have it rendred in English, or any other tongue. So the parallel place to this (that of *Jer. 23. 6.*) is interpreted. *Vajikra Schemo*, there is, His name shall be called; not, He shall call his Name. As again it is, *Isa. 9. 6.*

But that, with a *Dative Case* after it, it is so to be taken, in *Jer. 33. 16.* Let them shew if they will, or can, whose Stomachs serv to digest, or defend this last English Version. Which I cannot see caus to subscribe to, until som better proof is brought for it, than I finde to be against it.

When the trouble of this Examination was over, (for I found it not toooner;) I was not a litl glad to see that so worthy a Man as *Bishop Pearson*, and so able a Judge of these Matters, approves the Version of the Prophe's

† Artic. 2 pag. 149.

words, that I am pleading for, in his Exposition of the Creed, commonly called the Apostles.

By which interpretation *Crellius* with his Collegues and Disciples, being beaten off from taking *Sanctuary* there, against the force of the Argument grounded on *Jer. 23. 6.* they may seek som other place of refuge to protect them, if they will: but if none can be found, they are under a necessity of yielding what they would not grant, if they knew how to help it. That is, That our Lord *Jesus Christ*, who is honored with the name *Jebovab* (so proper to God, that it looks too big, and sounds too great for any other,) must needs be confessed to be *Very God*, as the Nicene Creed calls him, with as great Scripture-Evidence as can be desired.

How a Stranger to an *Hebrew Bible* would be able to grapple with one of these learned Adversaries, is more than I understand. My thoughts are, That his Case, in such a Contest, would be no better than that of a reformed Pastor, who meeting with a *Popish Priest*, at a public Feast, where a dispute happen'd, Whether *Ipse* or *Ipsa*, He or She, was the true Reading of *Genes. 3. 13*? (that is, Whether *Christ* himself, or the blessed Virgin, his Holy Mother, was to bruise the Serpent's head, according to that old prophecy?)

The Pastor said That the truth of the Hebrew Text was on their side, who giv the honor, of so great a Victory to the Son, not to his Mother. What then? Was the Priest as mute as a fish? Or as dumb as a Man that hath no power to open his mouth?



PaNo such Matter. Having a *Hebrew Bible* with him, he delivered it to the stor, to read the place disputed of.

Whereupon the surprized Man was amaz'd, to finde himself concern'd with one that had skill in what he himself was ignorant of, but presumed however to talk of.

And not being able to read the Text to which he appealed, was forced, for want of a *wiser Answer*, to say, That in *Holland* he had heard what he said, affirmed, and taught for truth. \*

So indeed the truth is. (For the *feminine* \* *Vld. Sixt. Amam. Pa-*  
pronoun *אִי*, agees not with the *masculine* *רנח. pag. 129.*

Noun *וְרֵי*; but with the other, *אִי*, which is of the same Gender, the Noun well accords. And it is not strange that one of these words, should in writing, be easily mistaken for the other; the likeness between the midl letters, where all the difference lyes, being so great, that the smallest stroke of a pen, forborn or continued, makes all the odds. For what can be neerer the same than [י] and [י'] i. e. *Van* and *God*?

Thence it is no wonder that both *Hierom*, and the old Latin translation have *Ipsa*, She, and not *Ipsa*, He; especially considering that *Zar'ab*, the word next before the controverted pronoun, hath a *feminine Affix*: Which a speedy transcriber might easily, in his haste think *HI* more agreeable to, than *HU*.

The *LXX* have *αὐτὸς*; meaning *Christ*; or referring it to the *Masculine αὐτός*, which might be in their mindes, tho' the *Neuter Σηίγμα* went before. Which the English word *IT*, in the now current and privileged translation, hath an aspect on.

But because it is not a *Thing* but *Person*, which *Moses* expresth in the monosyllable *HU*, it is better Englished, in my thoughts, by *HE*, as in the former translation, than by *IT*, as in the latter.)

Yet when all is said; let the Arguments brought to justify those Bibles which have *HE*, and not *SHE*, be as *sound as a Bel*, that hath no crack or flaw; the *Truth*, I think, was litl beholding to *so poor a Defendent* as this *weak disputant* was detected, as above-said, to be.

I would gladly put a period to what is farther to be said to and of this *Excellent Scholar*, who hath occasion'd my saying all this: but I cannot yet leav this forced Text of *Jeremiah*, (c. 33. 16.) pressed for a service it is not fit for, and compelled to go, *not a mile or two only*, but beyond the bounds of Truth and Reason, for none of the best purposes.

If our last English translation of the Prophet's words could be defended; (which I cannot grant; but suppose it could be;) it would not however serve the purpose, they bring it for, who contend to make us believ with *Ebion* and his followers (those poor Heretics, no richer in understanding than he that gave them their denomination, was in the signification of his name; †) that *Christ* is no more than a Creature, (or the mere

† *Ebion*, in *Ebrev* signifies *Poor*.

Son

son of *Joseph* and *Mary*; in defiance, as it were, of *John* 1. 1, 3. *Col.* 1. 16, 17. and all other Scriptures which teach the contrary to what they held, and taught.

For if *Jerusalem* is rightly called (according to the true sense of the words, before rehearsed,) *The Lord our Righteousness*: there is then an *Ellipsis* or defect of a word, which common reason (besides Scripture as above-shewed,) teacheth the Reader to ad: understanding it thus: She shall be called **THE CITY** of the Lord, &c. (Which agrees with the names elsewhere given it. *IR haelohim*, the City of God. *Psal.* 87. 3. and *IR hatsedek*, the City of righteousness. *Esa* 1. 26.) For as *Belial* alone stands for the men, or sons of *Belial*, 1 *Sam.* 23. 6. *Elohe-Jischrael*, *Gen.* 33. ult. for *Mizbakh Elohe*, &c. i. e. The God of Israel, for *The Altar* of the God, &c. (For *Jacob*, without doubt, did not think the Altar which he built at *Shalem*, to be God, *the God of Israel*: but to him it was dedicated, and by his name it was called; in this and no other sense, unless we would make him void of sense, in giving it a name which it was not capable of. Nor could *Moses* have other meaning when he called his Altar, *Jehovah-nissi*—*Exod.* 17. 15. or *Gideon*, *Judg.* 6. 24.)

So here, I say, *The Lord our righteousness*, stands for *The City of the Lord*, &c. And the place thus expounded, (as to make the translation holde to truth and sense, it needs to be :) our Unitarians must let it alone for ever; or produce it to no purpose hereafter; as I doubt not but that they have heretofore still don, before comperent Judges of the words.

It will not be denied that *Banner* (before-spoken of) had reason tho' he was not influenced by the best that might have mov'd him, to begin the Study of this *old-Testament-tongue*, in his very old age. How much better is it to set about it in those younger days, wherein memory is stronger, and the use to be made of it, greater?

But if any man thinks himself superannuated for such a purpose, let him learn of *Brasmas*, not to discourage younger people from undertaking it; especially by talking ignorantly of what he understands not.

That excellent Scholar indeed, would by no means dishearten the aged from entering upon it; having known, in his time, some famous men, who never began to study *Greek*, which is harder to be learned, till considerably past 40 Years old. Whose proficiency, however, appeared by monuments of their skill in that language left behind them.

And he himself after the 53d Year of his life returned to the study of *Hebrew*, having long intermitted it.

Whose Example and Counsel is doubtless much better than that which *John Dullard* (who deserved his name, if it signified in Latin as it doth in English,) gave *Ludovicus Vives*; whom he told, (being his Tutor, when

he spake it;) That the better Grammarian he was, the worse Philosopher and Divine he would be: (as *Vives* himself witnesseth. †) As if the Scriptures had ever been expounded more

† Lib. 2. de Conf. corrupt. Artium.



profitably, and *Theologically*, than by such as have handled them most *grammatically*.

This however was somewhat better than that miserable Monk's speech, who advised his Auditors to beware of the *Greek and Hebrew Fountains of Scripture*; which he said were full of *Vipers and Venomous Creatures*.

In those days of darkness, which were many, *Claudius Espenceus*, one of their own Bishops, complained, That to understand Greek was to be suspected of heresy. To which the knowledge of Hebrew being added, the suspicion was so aggravated, that 'twas hard to escape the name of an *Heretic*.

The learned *Man* was in those languages, the worse he was thought of. *Heterodoxy*, at least, if not *Heresy*, was suspected to be hid under every Greek and Hebrew word, by those blinde Guides, who spake evil of things which they knew not; like those *Heretics* indeed, whom *St. Jude* writes of, *v. 10th* of his general Epistle. But we see, by those few places of Scripture before-examin'd that there's no sure footing without it.

And I wonder with what Authority they can teach, assert, affirm, or deny, who, not having a foot of this ground to stand on, must needs be as far from being sure of what they say, as one that speaks a thing after another, who saw it with his own eyes, is from having as much knowledge of it as he that so beheld it.

Thence I conclude, That it better becoms a *Gown-man* (let him make what figure he will, or can, in the Church,) to spend a hundred Years, twice told (could he live so long,) in searching out the right sense of Scripture-words and phrases; than bestow a minute of time in talking Maliciously and Slanderously of such as meditate often on These things, and are much (if not wholly) given to them: not wasting away the day, much less waiting the night, among *Books*; but being night and day conversant among the best Books, which by any good means they can get the light and use of.

It is no wonder that any body given to idleness, should be given to drink likewise; (what is too bad or hard to be learnt of such a Teacher as idleness is?) or that much drink and more talk than is fit or meet, should go together. But they commonly offend most with their tongues who are most addicted to talk derived from drink.

And if *Thomas a Kempis* was not out in observing, That other people, tho' sober, seldom return from speech to silence without sin; (which he spake, I suppose, with an Eye to *Prov. 10. 10.*) who can expect that innocent Speech should flow from such a Fountain as I speak of?

His words, if, not having the book in hand, I mistake not, are in a Sermon ad silentium, the first catechism.

But of all Detraction that is most inexcusable, which speaketh evil of those who *deserv to bear wel.* And it is not a lill aggravated, when the Detractor himself is destitute of those good properties which a slandered Sufferer is worthy to be commended for, as the case often is: and I doubt not of laying here was, when this excellent Scholar (if rightly so called) *shot out his Arrows, even bitter Words,* against one, who never did, or intended to do him hurt; and of whom he could say no evil, without speaking as falsely, as maliciously and mischievously.

Impartial Judges have not otherwise determin'd; nor wil any but Parasites, Sycophants, and such, say the contrary, if any such wil.

And is this fit Work for an Ecclesiastic, which a Mechanic would have caus'd to be ashamed of?

Do not such Men forget what they have heard, read (or might and should) a hundred times and more, in the monthly course of the Psalms, out of Psal. 101. 6. *Whoso privily slandereth his Neighbor, him wil I destroy?* Were they never at Church on an Ash-Wednesday to help curse the Sinners, (and that deservedly) who are guilty of *swearing their Neighbors secretly?*

For who are they that *err from God's Commandment,* and are therefore *justly cursed* (Psal. 119. 21.) if these manifold Evil-doers are not som of that number; who seldom are, or can be guilty of a singl Sin, but commit a *threefold error* of iniquity, at least, when their Tongues are let loole to speak what they please of whom they list.

Is not a back-biting Tongue, for this reason called, *A third, or three-fold Tongue,* in the Greek Text of Eccl. 28. 15. for this, I say, Margin of our large English Bibles (tho' the sense of once?

the Phrase only is put into the Text. Agreeable to which, with the Latin Translations, that have *Lingua Tertia,* are the Syriac and Arabic Versions; the one having *Lashon telishba,* a threefold Tongue: the other *lashan thalish,* a threefold Man. All upon the same account. From whom the Chaldee Paraphrast, on Psal. 140. 12. differs not. Where the Title that he givs him, who in Hebrew is called *Isch lashon,* A Man of Tongue; (*A Man full of words,* in the old English Translation: *An evil-speaker,* in the last) is *Globar demischra' lishan telishba,* A Man that speaketh with a third, or three-fold Tongue.

1. The Evil-speaker himself, in telling more than is tru.
2. His Hearer, in making him believ a ly.
3. The slandered Sufferer; who is hereby robbed of what is *better than great Riches,* Prov. 22. 1. All which should here be shewed more at large, but that it is do'n already in another Discourse, which as yet lies hid, but had long since been brought to light, if ungodly People, for whose amendment it was written, had not hitherto hindred it, as a longer while they may.



But of this, no more here. To go on with what I was speaking of. What but Slander is his Master-piece of wickedness, who was a Slanderer from the beginning, and the prime Sin that made him so. Who in the Language of Sinne, is called *Othel-lor*, a Slanderer, for feeding, as it were, upon Calumny and false Accusation. Which to him is no less agreeable than Meat and Drink to the hungry and thirsty; but as much desir'd and delighted in, by him.

In the Greek Tongue there is no difference at all between a Slanderer and a Devil; both the one and the other being there called by the same name, and expressed by the same words, *Diabolos*.

So the only thing, it seems, which makes them differ, is, That the one is a Devil incarnate, the other a Devil incorporeal. The one a Devil of Hell, the other a Devil upon Earth only: (but who is in a ready way to meet his Name-sake, in his proper place: The one a Corporal, the other a Spiritual Devil. Whole eldest Daughter, if Calumny hath been rightly called; What hinders, that a Calumniator should not pass for his first-born Son, and dearest Child; who so well resembles his Father, that one Sinner cannot be more like another, than he and his Child are like each other.)

I cannot but wonder, that so learned an Author as *Johannes Clericus*, should render those words of *Moses*, *Deut. 17. 24. An. maccheb re ebou basscher*, *Maledictus qui clam occidit proximum suum*, i. e. Cursed he who killeth his Neighbor secretly.

And for that *Paulus* *Episcopus* should make Calumny, or smearing with the Tongue, to be but a secundary fault of the place (which he granteth, may be referr'd to such blows; †) when it seems, for no contemptible reasons, to be the primary, and only meaning.

Manifest Murther (saith the first named of *Polum ad loc.*) in these two excellent Men, was punished with Death. From whence the conclusion, or inference, must be (tho, he doth not express it) That the Curse there spoken of, is directed against the author of secret Murthers; which not being detected, could not be so punished, but would, probably, be the rather avoided by saying, Amen to this Curse, their own mouths having then condemned them, if at any time they presumed to kill, or smite secretly and mortally, at once, not fearing the discovery of their guiltiness.

Such a Sinner, was no doubt as much (if not more) under the Wrath and Curse of God, as any the most manifest Murtherer, whom the Law took hold of. Rather more than less exposed to Divine Displeasure and Vengeance, he was, whose guiltiness (not appearing to Men, and so not punishable by them) may well be thought to have moved the Judge of all the Earth, the sooner and rather to take the matter into his own hands; and to make him the more dreadful Example (as *Cain*, we know, was





thing of the matter, which he never discovers, if at all, before he hath suffer'd by it.

That this is the primary, or rather only sense of the place, seems credible, because Murder (which is sinful and unlawful Slaughter) be it close or manifest, secret or open, is wont to be expressed by other Words than *Moses* here useth. Not by *Hiccup*, but *Harag* and *Rasak*: The last of which is the Word in *Exod.* 20. 13. Which most properly signifies to kill maliciously and unjustly; (otherwise it is not Murder:) Whereas *Hiccup* sometimes signifies to smite or strike without killing: at other times to strike or wound mortally (which is to kill) be it Man or Beast, or whatever Animal that receives the Blow; but is not murder'd, tho' killed outright: No nor being a Man himself, unless he is wrongfully wounded to Death.

This therefor is not the proper term, by which that sort of killing which the 6th Commandment forbids, is wont to be express'd.

Upon these Considerations (which without the addition of more, are sufficient to prove the thing intended;) it seems reasonable to conclude, that smiting, not with the Hand, but Tongue (by Detraction, Calumny, Slander, &c. according to the Phrase, *Jer.* 18. 18. is the fault spoken of, *Deut.* 27. 24. And I am not a little pleas'd with *Castellio's* Version of *Machabeh* *bassather*, Word for Word, by *occulte ceciderit* (which makes it exactly answerable both to the Hebrew Text, and the English Translation) for that reason.

This *Chrysostom*, *Jerom*, and others, have judg'd to be the sense of *μὴ πλάκτω*, No Striker, 1 *Tim.* 3. 3. being agreed, that the Apostle hath there to do with a Bishop's Tongue, not Hands, More, at least, with the former than the latter. As the Words next before, *μὴ πρὸς ὅποιον*, have been taken to signify, not a drunken, but contentious Sinner, "Who is ready to quarrel, and offer wrong, as one in wine."

So the Margin of our English Bibles expresseth it.

Which is also *Chrysostom's* sense of the place. And that deservedly.

For what need could *Timothy* have to be tolde, That a Drunken Fellow is not fit to be a Bishop?

And as he spake not, in the passage before this, of the Drunken, but proud, contumelious and contentious: So here he hath not to do with those that use violence with their hands, in *Chrysostom's* judgment. What then? (as he presently puts the Question.)

His Answer is: There are who deal more roughly and rigidly with their Brethren than is meet, [treating them with harder Words, and sharper Language than becoms them] whom the Apostle here seems to me to have respect to.

It is better, according to *Jerom*, (as he hath it, on the first Chapter to *Titus*) so to interpret the Apostle's Words; who being at Work, to form and fashion a principal Man of the Church, forbids him not to be guilty of what a Plebeian, or one of the common sort, ought to be reprehended

for: but bids him beware of making those worse by contumely and rashness of speech, whom by modesty and mildness he might render better. For this exposition Erasmus was so zealous that he spared not to ask, *What great Matter it is for a Bishop to forbear striking with his hands?* In imitation of whom, how can a Man that is no stranger to one of that order, who hath threaten'd to do worse, forbear to ask what commendation for a Church-man, of this high degree especially, it is, to be no better than a *Ruffian, Car-man, or one of the rude fellows*, with whom it is wont to be *But a word and a Blow?*

Yet it seems by the 28th of those *Canons*, more commonly than truly ascribed to the Apostles, (tho' nothing hinders them from being called Apostolical, as far as they agree with their doctrine;) That some such men were gotten into this Office, before Boniface was advanced to the See of Canterbury, or Bonner made Bishop of London. Wherefor else should that Canon, for this fault order them to be cast down from a dignity which without being worthy of it, they aspired to, and got possession of?

Now if this is the true sense of *smiting secretly*, and the right meaning of the place in *Deuteronomy* which condemns it with a Curse: Who can tell how often this Excellent Scholar hath *curst himself* with his own mouth, but he that knows how often he hath read the *Liturgical Communion*, or been present at another's reading it?

For let us take it for granted that he was not a *mute Auditor*, but vocal Answerer in saying *Amen* to as many Curses as are there appointed to be denounced against the ungodly, on the first day of *Lent* especially.

In the last of which number, he may finde *Slanderers* expressly named, to put the Matter out of doubt, if detraction, calumny, backbiting and whispering are not the very sins forbidden in the phrase of *smiting a Neighbor secretly*.

The word of God forbids every Man to speak evil of any Man; (see Tit. 3. 1.) in such a manner, and for such ends as ungodly people are generally guilty of evil-speaking. That is, rashly, falsely, uncharitably, and maliciously. *Vain-gloriously*, to set our selves forth the better. *Ambitiously*, to make another's disreputation a means of advancing our selves, or others whom we favor. *Avaritiously*, to make a gain of their defamation of whom we presume to speak evil. *Hypocritically*; when we know them to be better than we take it upon us to represent and report them to be; and are conscious of our own being worse than we desire and strive to be thought. *Censoriously*; when we know no ground for what we say. And *Presumptuously*, because we think our selves above the danger of being question'd for any thing we have said, or been pleased to speak.

In such a manner, and for such ends it is unquestionless unlawful to speak evil of any Man: tho' the Rule given, is subject, as most other are, to some exceptions. For it is not to be thought that the Apostle transgressed his own Law in calling the *Galatians Fools*; or in painting out other sinners in their proper Colours.

But



But if every Man's fame must be handl'd as tenderly and carefully as things that are choicest and aptest to take hurt are wont to be: how much greater respect belongs and regard is due to such a Man's credit, whose Office, without it, is insignificant and useless to the best purposes?

And if God himself (who best knows the difference of things, in point of worth,) hath advanced A good name *above great riches*; (to stir us up, one may think, to study harder, and labor more to get and keep a good report, than to heap up Wealth;) who cannot tell which of the two bad is the greater thief, He that robs a Man of money or goods, or he that doth what he can (by false information and wrong accusation, which he knows no more how to justify, than where to finde a *Phenix* or *black Swan*,) to take away his good name? Which divine Wisdom having rated so highly, and set such a price upon as above-said, who but such as are careless of doing things that are *praise-worthy, lovely and of good report*, can despise or undervalue it?

It is pity that any of these *greater Thieves* and *Robbers* should escape discovery and punishment, while poor *Pilferers* and *petty-Larceners* are compell'd to suffer extremity of Law for smaller faults.

But let not their hearts however be harden'd and *set the more fully in them to do evil*, because sentence against their evil works is not speedily given and put in Execution.

For the word of God which condemns their evil-doings, will as surely *take holde of those Sinners* as ever it met with any other.

Who being of *their father the Devil*, and *doing his work*, cannot miss his Wages, unless they get into *better service* the sooner; being weary of his work, and sorry for doing as much of it as must sooner or later be repented of, if they would not perish and be undo'n for ever.

The *Romans, Athenians* and *Egyptians*, in old time, had strict Laws to restrain loose tongues, and prevent the defamation of good people who deserved not to be evil-spoken of. † *Vid. Job. 40. 1. and Exod. 23. 1.*

And is that lawful among Christians, which *sober Heathens* allowed nor?

Whosoever thinks it is, hath not well consider'd that not only to raise, but (what is less, tho' too much to be tolerated,) to do no more than receive *Sabema' Schav*, a false report, is condemned by *Exod. 23. 1.* and *Pf. 15. 3.* (according to the sense of the original words, *Thissa* and *Nasa*, in both places used;) that both the Speaker may take heed of what he saith, and the Hearer beware of what he believeth.

And if any Man holdes himself privileg'd to say, what he pleaseth of people in some *list* temporal regards inferior to him (tho' far above him, in the best and noblest respects;) in hope of bearing it out by the dignity of his Place or Office, Name or Title: let such a one know (what I wonder that any one professing learning should need to be tolde; especially being excellent at it;) That the higher a Man's place is (in the Church,

above

above all other places: the more unlawful it is for him to do any thing unbecoming it: And the holier function he hath, the more watchful he must be to avoid what will defecrate or unhallow it.

For who should use double diligence to behave themselves worthily in their places, but such as receive double honor (of maintenance and deference,) without which they would not think them worth their having?

If better Masters had never said a word of the Matter, might not such Men have learned of heathen Teachers themselves what their duty is? who are so far from giving them leav to be lawless, that they make fewer things lawful for them than for other folk. †

† *Multa tibi non licent, quæ humillimis & in angulo jacentibus licent. Magna servitas est magna fortuna. Non licet tibi quicquam arbitrio tuo facere. Sen. ad Pol. lib. 2. cap. 26. Splendor vester facit, ut peccare sine summo Reipub. detrimento non possitis. Cic. in Verrem. 3. In maxima fortuna minima est licentia. Sallust.*

But if none of those smaller Preceptors are worth their notice, what hinders that they should not learn of Ambrose, Gregory, Bernard, and the like more sure Guides, to ask themselves What agreement there is between sublimity of honor, and deformity of life? What a sacred habit means without a sanctified heart? (Which teacheth no Man's tongue to speak evil of those that do well. Nor indeed, of evil-doers themselves, in a culpable manner, for any such little ends, or bad purposes as evil-speakers commonly have an eye to.) What concord between

the name of a Pastor and the nature of a Wolf can be found? And what but height of hypocrisy is it to be called A Shepherd, and do the work of A Sheep-biter? To wear outwardly Sheep's-clothing, and be inwardly such ravening and ravenous creatures as false Prophets are said to be? Mat. 7. 15. If nothing else will make them hear and fear, and forbear to abuse their power, let them learn of a wiser Man than the wisest of such a Tribe, That the mighty (being guilty of these or other faults which they generally choose rather to be damned for than told of,) shall be mightily tormented, Wisd. 6. 6. Not for being mighty men but mighty Sinners.

For great benefits cannot be abused without great ingratitude; which an ordinary degree of punishment agrees not with. ||

No distemper can more threaten the whole body, or portend worse to it, than what proceeds from the head. Nor is any fall more dangerous and grievous than that which begins at a high place. By which who sees not how much better it is to stand on lower ground, than by climbing higher, to catch the greater fall? and how great a necessity of looking well to their Steps, that their feet slip not, they are under, who affect sublimity more than safety: according to the Counsel which a good old Bishop of Milan hath given, to make such rash Potentates more wary.

\* *Magna sublimitas, magnam debet habere cautelam. Honor grandis, grandior debet sollicitudine circumvallari. Cui plus credimus, ab eo plus exigimus. Ambrosius de Dignitate Sacerdotum, cap. 3.*



I might talk farther on with this *Excellent Scholar*, (if report hath said no more than is true;) but that I believ an odd reckoning which hath som while been between us, is by this time adjusted, and the uttermost farthing paid.

Som will think it a payment of Interest upon Interest. Which I am not willing to giv or take, nor believing the *simple* much less the *compound* lawful. The *overplus*, if any is, they may do what they please with; so they giv it to none but the needy. The fewest of which number are, in my opinion, too many; And if I could help it, should be none at all.

To diminish it as much as at present I can, (having more at hand when occasion calls for it;) all the Coin above-rolde out, hath been disburs'd. And the debt before-spoken of, being honesty paid to a farthing; here, *without offering a Mite more*, shall be

THE END.

---